

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 4-6 are pending herein. Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of cancelled claim 2 and to correct matters of form. Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to correct matters of form.

1. The objection to the abstract is noted, but deemed moot in view of the amended abstract filed herewith.
2. The rejection of claims 1-6 under §112, second paragraph, is noted, but deemed moot in view of the rewritten claims submitted above.
3. Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 were rejected under §102(b) over Porte. To the extent that this rejection may be applied against the amended claims, it is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 recites, among other things, a gliding board comprising a gliding surface that terminates in at least one raised end. The end has a peripheral zone and a central zone, the peripheral zone extending from sides of the end toward the central zone of the end. The peripheral zone has a thickness which is less than a thickness of the central zone of the end and is connected to the central zone by a discontinuity that forms an inflection. An upper face of the peripheral zone is substantially parallel to the gliding surface.

Porte discloses, in Figs. 4-9 and 11-15, the use of a chamfered surface or a radius located along an edge of the entire upper surface of the board. For instance, Figs. 6-9 and 13 show the chamfered surface beginning at a point 18 located on the

upper surface 1 and extending unchanged to a point 19 located along the edge of the board. Figures 11 and 12 show the use of a radius starting at point 18 and extending to a point 19 located on the edge of the board. None of the figures disclose the use of a chamfer or radius that does not extend to the edge of the ski allowing for a peripheral zone that is parallel to the gliding surface of the board.

In response to the Examiner's contention that Fig. 2 of Porte discloses the feature of an "upper face of the peripheral zone being substantially parallel to the gliding surface," Applicants respectfully submit that Fig. 2 of Porte fails to disclose a peripheral zone, which has a thickness that is less than a thickness of the central zone. Fig. 2 of Porte clearly shows only the central zone and the gliding surface.

For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that Porte fails to disclose a gliding board comprising a peripheral zone connected to a central zone by a discontinuity that forms an inflection, where the upper face of the peripheral zone is substantially parallel to a gliding surface of the board, as recited in claim 1. Since claims 5 and 6 depend directly from claim 1, claims 5 and 6 are also believed to be allowable over the applied art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

4. Claim 4 was rejected under §103(a) over Porte in view of Stoveken.

Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments submitted above distinguish claim 1 from Porte. Since Stoveken does not overcome the deficiencies of Porte, and since claim 4 depends directly from claim 1, claim 4 is also believed to be allowable over the applied art.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims herein define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for this application in due course.

If the Examiner believes that contact with Applicants' attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, the Examiner is herein requested to call Applicants' attorney at the phone number noted below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1446.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen P. Burr  
Reg. No. 32,970

SPB/TE/tlp

BURR & BROWN  
P.O. Box 7068  
Syracuse, NY 13261-7068

Customer No.: 025191  
Telephone: (315) 233-8300  
Facsimile: (315) 233-8320